

honesty and justice; to secure equal punishment for rich or poor when an honest administration of justice has been prevented by bribery. Already every effort is being made by the "higher-ups" and their purchased press to create the impression that Haas was crazy. Possibly so; and possibly he was afflicted with the same form of insanity as the men who tried twice to get rid of the pivotal witness by dynamite. Our higher-up judges, "friendly" to the machine and to wealthy corporations, its friends, eagerly seize upon the slightest technicality to release *self-confessed criminals*, while at the same time they deal out contemptuous comment upon an honest judge trying honestly and in the face of the strongest pressure, to do his simple duty. How long will the thinking people tolerate this assassination of justice and travesty on law and order?

On another page of this issue, the JOURNAL presents a communication from one of the members of our society upon the subject of the editorial contained in the October number and referring to the German Hospital. Some of the criticism voiced by our correspondent is just; some of it is ill founded and some part of it will doubtless always remain in the debatable territory. The German General Benevolent Society was founded as, and we believe in the main has always been conducted as a true benevolent institution that has been of the greatest benefit to a large number of its poorer members. As a part of its work, a hospital is required; recently it erected a magnificent building that will accommodate something over two hundred patients and, we understand, accumulated an indebtedness of several hundred thousand dollars in so doing. At the very outset we may concede without argument that it is a shame that a feeling of resentment and antagonism should exist on the part of a large number of physicians against the institution and thus prevent them from making use of the hospital. At the same time we must concede that there exist in the institution certain very objectionable features which fully account for and warrant the antagonism of the majority of our profession. An illustration will point out these abuses. It is reported that quite recently a patient consulted a physician in San Francisco who discovered a condition requiring surgical interference. He referred the patient to a surgeon who happened to be a member of the staff of the German Hospital; the diagnosis was confirmed and operation advised and consented to. A proper fee of several hundred dollars was to be charged, and the patient could well afford to pay the fee. But the matter was put off for a short time and during the interval the patient learned that he could become a member of the German General Benevolent Society and thus secure surgical attention free—or on the payment of the nominal monthly charge. He did so. The very same surgeon whom he had previously consulted was thereupon called to operate—for nothing! The existence of the institution, or of its bad fea-

tures, made it possible for this surgeon to be deprived of his legitimate charge.

Let us analyze the foregoing case, the facts of which are reported on the best of authority. In the first place, the surgeon was deprived of his honest fee; a fee which the patient could afford to pay. In the second place, the physician who referred the patient to the surgeon has lost a patient, for he may now receive all medical attention at no greater expense than the payment of his dues to the Society. In the third place, the hospital itself has lost money, for the patient paid less for hospital expenses than he otherwise would have paid—and which, be it remembered, he could afford to pay. In the face of facts illustrated by this case (and many others of a similar character might be mentioned) is it to be wondered at that physicians resent the occurrence of such incidents and the existence of an institution which permits them? Several hundreds of dollars were diverted from the regular course into the pockets of the surgeon and no one—save the patient in question—profited by the transaction; and he did not need or require the profit. Membership should be limited to those of very modest income who, in the event that they become incapacitated for work, do not therefore become a burden upon the community. Or, if membership is not thus limited, the right of any member to make use of the hospital facilities without payment, should be abolished. Very few physicians have a large income. They all do an enormous amount of work gratuitously and for pure charity. Is it right that they should be forced to give their attendance to people who can well afford to pay proper fees for it? Furthermore, no person not a member of the Society who reaches the German Hospital through or by means of a physician, should at any time thereafter be permitted to join the Society. If the German General Benevolent Society will make such changes as to prevent any of its members who can afford to pay legitimate fees for medical service from obtaining such service free (cut this "dollar-a-month" business down to those who really need it) and, secondly, if it will further protect the physicians of California by refusing membership to persons who are accustomed to consult and pay fees to a physician, and who can afford to do so, and also to those non-members who may be sent to the hospital as private patients of physicians—if it can and will do these things, then it should receive its full measure of professional support.

In his letter, Dr. Kreutzmann opens up the whole question of charity hospitals and hospital abuses. That there are always some people who will and do abuse every charity that has been or could be created, is well known. Every charity hospital that ever was run, has at some time or other been abused by some people. Every

dispensary is treating people, in greater or less numbers, who could and should pay physicians' fees. But that has nothing to do with wholesale abuses that could and should be stopped. The argument made by our correspondent to the effect that the University of California Hospital "is taking money out of the pockets of physicians" by competing with hospitals owned by physicians, is too lame for serious discussion. That is purely and simply competition on commercial ground; if a physician starts a private hospital it is his venture in commercialism—he is doing business—has become a business man subject to business or commercial competition; the running of a hospital for a profit is in no way a part of the liberal profession of medicine. In the case of the particular hospital mentioned, it is not a commercial enterprise; it is not founded for nor to be operated for the purpose of making money. If one enters here and pays fees, what he pays goes to help in maintaining the hospital for the use of those who cannot pay. Furthermore, the University of California Hospital and the Lane Hospital give back to the people of the state a large return; they are teaching institutions and they aid vastly in the training of our medical students. Where does the medical world profit—and through it all the people—from the immense amount of material that is passing through the German Hospital and its ilk? Occasionally some member of the staff of such an institution makes individual contribution to medical knowledge; but this is rare; in the main, it is wasted.

Nobody took much interest in the presidential election, but a good many people were very much interested in the campaign of
ELECTION RESULTS. Hughes of New York. The people won. Probably of next importance was the judiciary contest in San Francisco. An honest judge was elected, against almost impossible odds, and one who had lost the confidence of the people was defeated. Occasionally we contemplate the spectacle of the average citizen yawning, stretching himself and getting up to go out and vote; and then he lapses once more into troubled somnolence. But the "machine" never sleeps; and so, never has to rouse itself. It works all the time; and thus it gets what it wants and the "average citizen" rubs his eyes, when it is all over, and wonders how it happened—or else swears at the "machine" instead of at himself. Let us thank the good Lord that the "machine" is no more grasping than it is, for we are at its mercy.

The many reviews and published reports of the recent International Tuberculosis Congress but accentuate the utter impossibility of completely presenting the results of such a large and unwieldy aggregation. There is no point of perspective. Viewed broadly, the Congress was an immense success from the sociologic point of view. It attracted the notice and the attention of millions of people to preventive work

in tuberculosis. Most of the countries of the world were spurred to extra work on this particular subject, and even our own national government actually produced some matters which will tend to favorably affect public health—a thing almost unprecedented (of course excepting the work of the U. S. P. H. & M. H. S.): Many thousands of people were attracted to the exhibits and doubtless some few learned that it is no actual loss in dollars and cents to provide their tenants with sufficient light and air. In all the sections was a singular unanimity of expression of the all important necessity of educating the public, which may be taken as the key note of the congress. Much space has been given to the contention between Koch and everybody else; in nearly all the journals, and the subject seems hardly worth it. Were Koch a less notable figure, were it not for the fact that he discovered the bacillus tuberculosis, no great amount of attention would have been given to this difference of opinion. Twice has he changed his mind and he may do so many times again; that will in no way affect the facts that are known or will be discovered. Discussion upon matters of mere opinion is a sad waste of time. Furthermore, it is immaterial whether the bovine bacillus produces pulmonary consumption in man or not; it is admitted that it does produce other forms of the disease in man, and all are equally undesirable. Tubercle bacilli in milk do not make it more appetizing. A tempest in a tea pot, forsooth. If a man is right, time will prove it; if he is wrong, the fact will in due course be known, and this whether the whole world is with him or against him.

For the first time in the history of the state, if we are correctly informed, a physician has got out an injunction to prevent a committee on ethics of a medical society from investigating charges made against him. In San Francisco, it is reported, Dr. Canac-Marquis was charged with having agreed to and attempted to perform an abortion. The matter was referred in the regular way to the committee on ethics and the doctor was duly notified. He immediately went into court and asked that the committee be enjoined from interrogating witnesses or in any way proceeding with the investigation. Owing to faulty wording of the by-laws and to the fact that the charges were not correctly presented, the injunction was made permanent. What will happen next?

We are beginning to hear quite a little of the serum diagnosis of syphilis, though it is as yet a very long way from being an everyday possibility. Nevertheless,
DIAGNOSIS OF SYPHILIS. as a definite scientific advance it seems to have passed the stage of question and is to be accepted as a fact. The Wassermann method, so-called, which is based upon hemolysis, is, for practical purposes, impossible. It is quite possible, however, that the serum method of Fornet and others will subsequently be